DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 481 SP 002 071

By- Rivlin, Harry N.

The Urban Education Programs at Fordham University's School of Education.

Fordham Univ., Bronx, N.Y. School of Education.
Pub Date Nov 68
Note- 13p.
EDRS Price MF- $0.25 HC- $0.75
Descriptors- *Administrative Personnel, College School Cooperation, Educational Programs, Faculty, Field Experience Programs, Interinstitutional Cooperation, Professional Training, *Program Descriptions, School Community Cooperation, *Specialists, *Teacher Education, Teacher Experience, *Urban Education
Identifiers- Fordham University, New York

The preparation programs for urban teacher, administrator, and specialist (e.g., guidance counselor, school social worker, etc.) at Fordham University's School of Education are described in terms of the urban setting; the university-community relationship; cooperation between the school of education and other university units; and the faculty involved, including the name of each member and a brief description of his qualifications. Features of the programs include (1) on-the-job training with university guidance, support, and supervision; (2) learning by performing a skill in the context in which it will be used; (3) theory and practice taught as two phases of the same process; (4) emphasis on social as well as individual factors affecting learning; (5) cooperation between schools, communities, and universities; (6) continuing professional growth of both school and university personnel; (7) intrauniversity cooperation; and (8) for the teacher, rapid preparation as an apprentice teacher and subsequently as a beginning teacher, with advanced study of education problems and practices postponed until enough teaching experience is gained to give such advanced study meaning. The first class in the teacher preparation program began in February 1967. (SG)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE URBAN EDUCATION PROGRAMS AT FORDHAM UNIVERSITY'S SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

I. The Setting

The city's schools are under great and conflicting pressures, with each of these pressures coming from a group that is justified in what it is demanding. Thus, those who are aware of the tremendous rate at which knowledge is growing and of the important unsolved problems with which our nation must deal insist that the schools have to teach more and our students have to learn more.

Parents who want their children to go to college, and who know of the tremendous number of high school graduates trying to get into first rate colleges, are determined that their children's education be so good that their sons and daughters will be admitted to the college of their choice. If these parents think that the school's curriculum is being watered down, they simply take their children out of the city's schools and either enroll them in a private school or move to the suburbs.

Civil rights groups realize that education alone cannot eliminate poverty and racial discrimination, but that there can be no mass upward social mobility without education. They are demanding, therefore, that society make up for past neglect by focusing its attention on the education of disadvantaged children. They see the school as the avenue to a better life, but they are disheartened by the number of STOP signs they encounter. They want their children to be taught by interested and experienced teachers who use a curriculum that is as rich and as stimulating as that in any middle class school.

There are also other pressures and conflicts. Teachers and administrators who have gained their positions through open competitive examination and who have served long enough to have tenure believe that such positions should be filled only by competitive examinations, free from considerations of race, creed, or national origin. On the other hand, members of minority groups argue just as vehemently for having more minority members as teachers and administrators and regard competitive examinations as a device used by the Establishment to bar them. There are also often sharp and violent disagreements among various segments of the community and the professional staff as to the role the community should play in urban education.

These are the pressures and the conflicts that bedevil the urban schools and that divide the citizenry. They are the background causes of strikes, boycotts, and violence.

Although the difficulties are great, they are not unique to New York City, for they are to be found not only in the other large cities across the country but

ED025481
SP002071

also in smaller cities and even in the towns. Serious though the problems are, we must not forget that New York City and all other American communities also have resources - human, cultural, financial - that can help provide solutions.

How can we educate both the poor child and the middle class youngster? How can we make schools responsive to the community's hopes and plans without hostile confrontations between militant community members and equally militant school personnel? How can we prepare teachers, administrators, and other school personnel so that they can function effectively in our urban schools?

These are the questions that must be answered if all of the urban children are to get education of the quality they deserve and need.

II. The Preparation of Urban Teachers

If the problems of urban education are to be solved -- and they must be if our cities and our nation are to survive -- it will be through the efforts of capable, understanding, and imaginative teachers and administrators who have the resources they need and the active cooperation of all citizens interested in the improvement of education. It is because the effective preparation of professional personnel for urban schools is so urgently needed that the Forham University School of Education attaches such great importance to its role in urban education.

As a first step, the University appointed a new dean of education whose professional career has been devoted to urban education. Dr. Rivlin came on September 1, 1966 and addressed the faculty on November 8. As is customary at a new dean's first faculty meeting, he spoke of some of his hopes and described a new pattern of urban teacher education on which he had been working for some time. While the dean's opening comments were in line with academic tradition, the faculty reaction was not. Often, after a new dean offers such a proposal, there is polite applause, a senior member of the faculty makes a complimentary response, and the proposal is referred to a faculty committee for proper academic burial. Instead, the Fordham faculty discussed the proposal then and there and voted unanimously to approve it. Several faculty members volunteered to start work at once on the new courses that were needed.

A few days later, the dean discussed the program informally with a group of student leaders and optimistically suggested that it might be started the following September. One of the seniors summed up student response, "That's for posterity. How about us?"

Urged on by such evident student and faculty enthusiasm, committees proceeded with most unacademic speed and the first class in the new program met on

February 1, 1967, exactly five months after a new dean had arrived with a new idea.

A grant from the NDEA National Institute for Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth enabled Fordham to enlist the services of consultants from many disciplines and several universities as well as school personnel in preparing instructional materials for the new programs. These materials have been published by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education as "Working Paper/ One The Preparation of Urban Teachers; A Syllabus" and have been distributed to colleges and universities across the country.

The Assumption Underlying the Program:*

1. Only adequately prepared teachers are equal to the job of providing quality education for all urban children -- the privileged and the underprivileged, the academically talented and those who have previously been denied full opportunity for educational achievement.

2. The proper use of paraprofessionals can improve the effectiveness of urban teachers, and on-the-job service in a paraprofessional capacity can be important in the preparation of teachers.

3. Urban schools need teachers who understand the problems and the aspirations of urban children and have confidence in their ability to teach them.

4. Urban teachers must understand the social pressures affecting their children as well as the psychological factors customarily studied and must be able to work effectively with parents and with members of the community.

5. Because the urban population is so varied ethnically, socially, and intellectually, prospective teachers should become familiar with the wide array of educational programs in the metropolitan area, but the apprenticeship should be served in inner city schools in order to destroy stereotypes of slum children and slum schools and to develop skill and self-confidence as a teacher there.

6. How children learn and how we teach them are so closely interrelated that these two phases should be taught together rather than in separate courses.

7. On-the-job training is so important that the school classroom should be the central place for teacher education.

8. The newly appointed teacher needs continued support and guidance from the university as an integral part of the teacher education program.

Our goal is modest. We want the beginning teacher to be so successful in

---

*These programs are available on all levels from early childhood to senior high school and are open to liberal arts graduates and to seniors in cooperating liberal arts colleges. Advanced graduate programs in urban education leading to higher degrees or professional diplomas are open to qualified experienced teachers.

his first years and to find such satisfaction in teaching that he will become a career teacher, steadily growing in skill, insight, and effectiveness. The young teacher who drops out after a year or two of service or does not accept even a first appointment, will be lost to the profession, regardless of how many preliminary education courses he has had or how rich a background he may have in the liberal arts. We want our students to become successful beginning teachers so that they may develop the drive and acquire the background to become successful career teachers.

The Characteristic Features:

1. Provision is made for active participation by members of the community and of school faculties in planning and conducting teacher education programs.

2. These programs stress on-the-job training for teachers, but always with the guidance, support, and supervision from the university, the schools, or both, to the extent necessary to protect children from incompetent teachers. No teacher is ever asked to assume responsibilities which he is not able to discharge effectively.

3. These programs enable the prospective teacher to prepare himself quickly for service as an Apprentice Teacher and subsequently as a Beginning Teacher, putting off the advanced study of educational problems and practices until the teacher has a background of experience to give meaning to these courses and the personal motivation to pursue them.

4. These programs apply basic principles of learning to the education of teachers and stress the importance of the teacher's learning by doing, of learning a skill in the context in which it will be used, of the careful gradation of learning so that the learner masters one phase before he goes on to the next, and of the feeling of success as an incentive to further learning.

5. These programs stress the connection between theory and practice and the relationships among various phases of education. For example, educational psychology and methods of teaching are taught as two phases of the same process rather than as independent courses studied at different times.

6. These programs recognize that learning is a social as well as an individual process. They help teachers to deal with both the social and the individual factors that affect learning.

7. These programs see teacher education as a truly cooperative undertaking by communities, schools, and universities engaged in a joint enterprise. Thus they avoid conflict between universities preparing teachers for the kind of schools they hope their graduates will help create and school systems struggling

to solve their real and present problems.

8. These programs bridge the gap that unfortunately exists too frequently between the pre-service programs conducted by universities and the teachers' initial experiences after appointment by a school system. They assume that the education of a new teacher does not end with certification but must be continued into his first years on the job. They stress, therefore, that Beginning Teachers need appropriate assignments by the school system and continued help from the university. When a beginning automobile driver passes his road test and gets his first driver's license, he is not given an entry blank to the Indiannapolis Speedway for the Memorial Day races and he is not asked to drive a huge trailer truck through the garment district. Why, then, should a newly certified teacher be assigned to a class that would tax the ingenuity of a highly skilled and experienced teacher?

9. These programs treat the prospective teacher as a member of the school faculty and utilize the services of the participants as school aides and as Apprentice Teachers to improve the effectiveness of urban schools.

10. These programs provide for the kinds of cooperative pre-service and on-the-job teacher education activities designed to lead to continuing professional growth of both school and university personnel.

11. These programs utilize the university resources in many disciplines, in addition to those usually available in teacher education programs.

12. By appropriate listing in the university catalog and by the extension of such privileges as tuition free enrollment in a graduate course, these programs recognize the contribution made by the cooperating teacher to the Apprentice Teacher's professional growth.

The Program:

The first phase of the program, Children and Youths in Urban Schools, deals with the physical, psychological, and social factors affecting the development of urban children and youths. As an integral part of this course, students serve as school aides and as assistants in social case work agencies. Guest lecturers have included scholars from other disciplines as well as panels of school children, beginning teachers, and minority group members who "tell it like it is." In this course, as in the other major courses, the usually rigid clock-hour class schedule is replaced by more flexible and functional time units.

In the second phase, the prospective teacher's time is divided between service as an Apprentice Teacher and related course work. Thus, elementary school Apprentice Teachers are assigned to specific inner city schools where they serve

as paid assistant teachers approximately four hours a day, five days a week, for the entire school year. Their course work consists of an appropriate section of Learning and Teaching, which is taught by a teaching team that includes a psychologist and several curriculum specialists to make certain that educational psychology and methods of teaching are studied as interrelated areas. To tie the course to the Apprentice Teacher's classroom experience, the members of the teaching teams work closely with the Apprentice Teachers in the inner city schools.

By using portable video equipment, it is now possible to make a video tape recording of a class being taught by an Apprentice Teacher. The video tape can then be played while the student and his supervisor are back at the University. In this way, the Apprentice Teacher can actually see what he did while he was teaching and note much which he may have been unaware of while he was actually teaching his class. The video tape also enables both the Apprentice Teacher and his supervisor to compare the performance at a point early in the semester with that of the same Apprentice Teacher later on in order to evaluate the improvement that has been made and to see where further improvement is necessary.

Before entering the third phase, the participants in the programs have become eligible for full time teaching appointments. As Beginning Teachers, they have classroom assignments they can handle as beginners. University instructors work with the individual teachers through the year on their classroom problems and, in cooperation with school personnel, offer appropriate counsel and support.

Contributions to the Improvement of Teacher Education:

Fordham has not solved the problems of urban teacher education, but some aspects of the new programs have interested other institutions. For example, the development of a joint community-school-university Policy Committee is useful not only as a means of improving teacher education but also as a medium whereby a concerned community and an interested university may communicate with each other.

The curricular materials which have been published as Working Paper/One may be useful at many other institutions which are trying to interrelate theory and practice.

Shifting the focus of teacher education from the college lecture hall to the school classroom is providing effective on-the-job training.

Providing continued help in the Beginning Teacher's first year of service is a way of improving teacher effectiveness and reducing teacher drop outs.

Student involvement in community action groups and social service agencies counteracts the stereotypes of poor people and also gives community members first

hand acquaintance with motivated young people preparing to teach.

Evaluation:

Although the programs are so new that our graduates just have not been in the schools long enough for us to determine their competence or their lasting commitment, we have engaged an experienced evaluator from another institution to assess our strengths and suggest modifications. Meanwhile, faculty and student evaluation of the programs has been almost continuous, enabling us to make changes constantly in response to faculty and student feedback. Overall, the reaction has been overwhelmingly positive. The programs are growing and flexible, affording stimulation and challenge for both faculty and students. As one colleague said, "We never worked so hard before or enjoyed it as much."

III. The Administrator's Training Program

The School of Education of Fordham University has established a new full-time program of graduate studies for the preparation of principals and assistant principals for elementary, intermediate and junior high schools, equipped to deal effectively with the wide variety of educational needs of the urban community. The program seeks to develop the insight, attitude, understanding and competence necessary for effective professional leadership in these schools.

The program includes a year of full-time graduate study, with related field experiences and an internship. Students are expected to be available throughout the day to engage in the planned experiences that are part of this program. When the administrator has been apointed, he may enroll in the practicum dealing with the problems he meets in his new position.

In the first semester, the program includes three basic courses and concomitant field experiences in schools and community. One of these courses, The Development of Relationships is designed to develop an appreciative understanding of the nature and processes of our democratic society and of the strategies for applying that understanding to the operation of an urban school. The course includes such considerations as the identification of the values, resources and power structure of the local community and the utilization of these to enhance the school's educational program, and the development of competence in anticipating and dealing effectively with difficult human relations problems within and outside the school.

The second course, Improving the Learning-Teaching Process, is designed to develop leadership in such areas as the motivation and guidance of the staff toward attaining higher levels of professional interest and performance; assisting

teachers to deal with the factors which impede the urban child's learning; curriculum development and adaptation; developing appropriate procedures for appraising the total learning situation in a school; and establishing programs to insure educational growth and improvement.

The third course, Concepts, Processes and Theories of Educational Administration develops competence in such areas as the utilization of time-tested theories of school administration, receptivity toward new approaches to administrative theory and practice, the ability to appraise them critically and the disposition to try out the most promising ones within the limits of available and newly secured resources. The course includes the development of understanding and application of such administrative processes as communication, decision-making and systems analysis. It also seeks to develop an attitude on the part of the principal that will lead to optimum balance between his independent professional thinking and his implementation of policies established by central administration.

The second semester of the program includes an internship and the course: Principles, Policies, Procedures and Problems in Administering an Urban School. The internship is designed to afford the student a continuing opportunity to perform the duties of the title to which he aspires. The internship provides for planned observation and participation in the administrative and supervisory activities of an urban school, including faculty conferences, team teaching planning sessions, parents meetings, curriculum committee meetings, community projects, and professional association meetings.

Using the internship experiences as a point of departure, the course is designed to provide systematic inquiry into such areas as organizing for instruction; pupil classification, grading and promotion; plant utilization; guidance services; relevant aspects of education law; administrative aspects of experimentation, research and evaluation; and organization and administration of auxiliary programs and services.

A practicum, Problems of the Beginning Principal and Assistant Principal, extending over two semesters, is available to the beginning administrator as he attempts to meet the on-going problems that are new to him.

IV. The Preparation of Other Specialists in Urban Education.

Urban education today is markedly different from the picture of Mark Hopkins at one end of the log and the student at the other. Today, we have teachers, teacher aides, assistant teachers, special teachers for the mentally retarded and for the emotionally disturbed, remedial reading teachers, guidance counselors, librarians, school social workers, psychologists and many, many others. All of the

graduate programs in the School of Education are in the process of revision in order to make certain that they will prepare the many kinds of educational specialists needed in urban schools.

Clearly, these schools need good teachers and administrators. While it is important that we prepare capable and concerned beginning teachers for urban schools, we must also make certain that the experienced teachers develop the added insight and gain the specialized skills that distinguish the professional teacher from the schoolmarm. To help these teachers to work well with urban communities, programs leading to the M.S. in Urban Education or to an Advanced Professional Diploma in Urban Education include such studies as those designed to familiarize teachers with African and Afro-American Culture, Latin American Cultures, Intergroup Relations, and What the Community Expects of the School. In order to make teachers more competent in dealing with the urgent problems of urban schools, opportunities are included for the development of such experts as reading specialists who can prevent and correct the reading deficiencies so common in inner city schools, and curriculum experts who can introduce the curricular innovations and the new techniques now available for urban schools.

While urban schools have many of the same problems as are found in suburban and even rural schools, these problems often take on a new dimension in urban communities. Thus, while all children need and deserve professional counseling regardless of the kind of community in which they live, the counselor and the school psychologist in ghetto schools must understand the pressures and the ambitions of minority group members. Those who work in these schools must be aware, for example, of the new doors that have now been opened to Negroes and Puerto Ricans and they must understand the effects of heightened levels of expectations and of frustations.

Similarly, the experts in research design and in evaluation must understand the urban community and the urban school if these experts are to help the urban communities to solve their educational problems. In recent years, for example, millions of dollars have been spent in experiments and in demonstrations aimed at improving the education of both the disadvantaged and the academically talented. Who is prepared to evaluate these new procedures in terms of the effect on the urban child and the urban community? Can we determine which element of the costly innovation is of pivotal importance so that we can afford to extend this specific part of successful pilot project to more children instead of concluding that the innovation as a whole is so costly that it must be diluted when extended to other children, thereby losing its effectiveness?

If Fordham can help develop the many urban education specialists our communities and schools need, it will make a notable contribution.

V. The University and the Community

There has been an almost revolutionary change in the relationships between school and community. Traditionally, it was the school that made educational plans, interpreted them to the community, and then tried to use the community as a resource in achieving educational goals. Today, the community wants to participate actively in formulating educational plans and it wants to communicate them to the school and use the school's resources in achieving the community's goals. Better liaison between universities and communities is essential for, after all, the most highly skilled teacher of reading cannot help any youngster learn to read if a hostile community bars that teacher from entering the school. Accordingly, Fordham has organized a Policy Committee consisting of representatives from community action programs, from the schools with which the university cooperates, and from students enrolled in the program, with School of Education personnel constituting a small minority of the total groups. This Policy Committee should help Fordham to improve its teacher education programs and also help make them understood and accepted by the communities which they are designed to serve.

VI. Cooperation with Other Units of Fordham University

The School of Education is fortunate in being part of a great university whose resources can be tapped in the development of educational leaders and practitioners in urban schools. The School of Social Service and the School of Education have a joint faculty committee to recommend ways in which these two professional schools can work together. The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and the School of Education have a joint committee which is formulating an urban core of graduate courses that draws on such disciplines as political science, economics, sociology, and anthropology which should give School of Education students greater insight into the background causes of today's problems. This faculty group is also planning a program of advanced studies which hopefully will lead to a doctorate in urban education as a means of preparing the leaders our schools and communities need. Such programs should provide ample opportunity for first-hand field experiences and for internship.

The School of Education has established an Advisory Curriculum Council on which will be represented not only all the various schools at Fordham University which have a contribution to make to urban education but also members of the community, students and alumni. We look to this Advisory Curriculum Council to review the adequacy of our programs from the standpoint of interested and disinterested outsiders and to indicate new areas in which the School of Education should be active but in which it has not yet participated fully.

VII. The Faculty

When the School of Education initiated its push for working with urban communities and urban schools, it was fortunate in having a nucleus of capable and interested faculty members, but obviously the group was much too small to deal with the magnitude of the problems and opportunities that lay ahead. That the School of Education has been successful in attracting the additional capable faculty members needed to lead and conduct the new programs is indicated by the following brief summaries of those who have been appointed to the School of Education within the past few years.

Bonnie Lauris Ballif (Ph.D. Brigham Young University) earned her doctorate with distinction and came to Fordham University from the University of Hawaii, where she was active in directing major research which she is now continuing at Fordham, involving a nation-wide evaluation of Headstart. Currently, she is developing instructional techniques to teach motivation to achieve in preschool children, with further refinements of a measuring instrument.

Harold F. Cottingham (Ed.D. Indiana University), John Mosler Professor of Urban Education, 1968-1969; author of three books and more than twenty articles in his field of counseling and guidance; former president of the National Vocational Guidance Association and American Personnel and Guidance Association; recognized nationally as a leader in Counselor Education.

Cecilia Lola Gersch (candidate for Ph.D. in School Psychology at New York University), whose background in psychology and experience as a nursery school and elementary school teacher, in combination with practice and teaching of psychology, have made her an effective member of the faculty team in the Learning and Teaching courses.

Vincent J. Cincotta (Candidate for the doctorate in modern languages at the Middlebury Language Schools), an experienced teacher of foreign languages and of English to non-English speaking children in Newark and the greater Paterson area in New Jersey; has been working with the students preparing to teach languages in urban schools.

Harry B. Gilbert (Ph.D. New York University), formerly Assistant Dean, College of Education, Pennsylvania State University; member of the Board of Examiners, New York City Board of Education; Supervisor of Psychologists, Bureau of Child Guidance; Diplomate in Clinical Psychology; and experienced in dealing with children with psychological problems and in ways of dealing with them in an urban context.

Carolyn N. Hedley (Ed.D. University of Illinois), formerly with the University of California at Santa Barbara; an experienced elementary school teacher in San Francisco and elsewhere, who has taught all grades from the nursery through the eighth grade; has traveled extensively (circled the globe two times) and has done research in curriculum in England, the Scandinavian countries, France, Austria, Hungary and Yugoslavia.

Joseph Justman (Ph.D. Columbia), formerly Acting Director, Bureau of Educational Program Research and Statistics at the New York City Board of Education; contributed to or author of 17 books and monographs and almost 40 professional articles as well as a major author of a standardized achievement test; an experienced classroom teacher, college lecturer and researcher.

John B. King (Dr. of Pedagogy, St. John's University), formerly Executive Deputy Superintendent of Schools, New York City, with a rich and varied experience in urban education, which included service as a principal of the largest elementary school in New York City and direction of numerous innovative practices in the New York City schools.

Joseph F. X. McCarthy (Ph.D. Fordham University), an experienced teacher and principal in the New York City schools, Dr. McCarthy was working on plans for educational parks for the New York City Board of Education when he joined our faculty in helping to prepare instructional administrators for urban schools.

Sheldon Marcus (candidate for the doctorate at Yeshiva University), who has been a social studies Chairman, teacher and guidance counselor working with children living in low socio-economic neighborhoods, has also taught other teachers how to teach the socially disadvantaged child. His writings include contributions in both history and education.

Allan C. Ornstein (candidate for the doctorate at New York University), six years of experience as a New York City secondary school teacher; also an assistant director of NYU NDEA Institute on the Culturally Deprived Child; author of more than 35 articles dealing with the education of disadvantaged urban children and author of two books which are to be released this year, with another book in the process of preparation.

Lillian Restaino (Ph.D. Columbia), with a background that includes elementary school teaching in New York City, college teaching at Monmouth College and principal investigator of an Office of Education funded research project, Dr. Restaino is a member of the teaching team in Learning and Teaching which presents the psychology of learning and methods of teaching as interrelated phases of a single problem.

Harry N. Rivlin (Ph.D. Columbia) was Dean of Teacher Education for The City University of New York that has prepared most of New York City's teachers and administrators. He has also served as coordinator and consultant for the Great Cities School Improvement Program, as chairman of the AACTE Subcommittee on Preparation of Teachers for Urban Schools, and is a trustee of the Center for Urban Education.

Rev. Leonard P. Stocker, O.M.I. (Ph.D. Fordham), with more than 20 years of experience as a college teacher of English and Education, and a doctorate in the field of educational psychology and measurement, Dr. Stocker is teaching graduate students in the Division of Educational Psychology, Guidance and Measurement.

Philip D. Vairo (Ed.D. Duke University). Dr. Vairo has taught in the New York City public schools and at colleges and universities, both in New York and out of town and is the author of more than 25 published articles, monographs and reports. That he should have been named acting chairman of the Division of Curriculum and Teaching after having been at Fordham University only one year is indicative of his acknowledged ability and leadership in urban teacher education.

Helen Vaughn (Ph.D. Michigan State University) is an experienced teacher at all levels from kindergarten through and including college and has taught a wide variety of students ranging from educationally disadvantaged youngsters to academically talented secondary school and college students. Dr. Vaughn has served as reading consultant for the Diocese of Nassau in the Bahamas, as research consultant for the Northwestern University Curriculum Center, and as the director of the Yale University summer high school at New Haven, Connecticut.

Thomas G. Vinci (Ed.D. Columbia) has been an elementary school teacher in New York City and the science coordinator for a Harlem school district. He has also taught graduate and undergraduate courses at various private parochial and public institutions. He is the author of various science syllabi used in New York City and has edited professional papers in science education.

Brother Cormac Waldron (Ph.D. Fordham) has been appointed jointly by the Sociology Department at Fordham University and the School of Education as an indication of his ability to work with graduate students who are approaching the problems of urban life and urban education from separate, but hopefully interrelated, points of view.

November 1968

Harry N. Rivlin